

# Congress of the United States

## Washington, DC 20515

December 10, 2025

The Honorable Pete Hegseth  
Secretary  
U.S. Department of Defense  
1400 Defense Pentagon  
Washington, DC 20350

Secretary Hegseth,

I write to express my profound concern about your use of the term “G2” to describe the relationship between the United States and the People’s Republic of China (PRC).<sup>1</sup> This term carries deeply problematic connotations of depicting the United States and PRC as co-equal and primarily cooperative powers responsible for deciding global issues while sidelining U.S. democratic allies and partners. In reality, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) views the United States as its primary strategic adversary and is making unrelenting efforts to replace it as the world’s most powerful and influential nation. As such, your description of the U.S. relationship with the CCP as a “G2” is deeply troubling and suggests a fundamental misreading of the United States’ foremost global adversary that risks dangerously undermining the Pentagon’s preparations for deterring conflict in the Indo-Pacific.

Since at least the end of the Cold War, the CCP has viewed the United States as its primary strategic opponent and directed the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) to develop the capabilities to defeat the armed forces of the United States and its allies and partners in a conflict in the Indo-Pacific. To resource this effort, Beijing has increased its defense spending from approximately \$22 billion in 2000 to almost \$300 billion in 2023—a more than 1,300% increase in just over 20 years.<sup>2</sup> This meteoric rise in spending, paired with significant advances in defense technology, has transformed the PLA from a military primarily focused on continental defense to one capable of projecting power out to and even beyond the Second Island Chain. Today, the PLA is a near-peer of the U.S. military and presents serious challenges to our interests.

Several recent developments illustrate the extent of the PLA’s threat to the United States and its allies. Last month, the PLA Navy commissioned its first aircraft carrier equipped with an electromagnetic aircraft launch system, the Type 003 *Fujian*, bringing Beijing’s carrier fleet to three and dramatically increasing its blue-water power projection capabilities. Second, recent reporting revealed that since 2020 the PRC has expanded 65 of its 99 sites linked to missile research, testing, and production facilities by over 21 million square feet, greatly enhancing the

---

<sup>1</sup> Pete Hegseth on X: “I just spoke to President Trump, and we agree — the relationship between the United States and China has never been better. Following President Trump’s historic meeting with Chairman Xi in South Korea, I had an equally positive meeting with my counterpart, China’s Minister of” / X

<sup>2</sup> China Military Spending/Defense Budget | Historical Data | Chart | 1989-2023

PLA's ability to scale and develop advanced munitions that would be key in a regional conflict.<sup>3</sup> Relatedly, Beijing has embarked on a massive expansion of both its conventional and nuclear ballistic missile forces. The PRC's current nuclear trajectory suggests the PLA will field over 1,000 nuclear weapons by 2030, nearly doubling its current inventory and presenting unprecedented challenges to strategic stability in the Indo-Pacific region.

As Secretary of Defense, your foremost duty is to follow both U.S. and international law while ensuring the U.S. armed forces stand ready to deter conflict and keep Americans safe. Successive administrations from both political parties have now assessed the PRC to be the primary strategic competitor of the United States, and have framed their core national security documents, force posture, and defense procurement accordingly. Your Department's forthcoming National Defense Strategy marks a critical juncture in the development of U.S. strategy, and it is essential that we correctly frame the U.S.-PRC relationship and give our servicemembers the guidance they need to counter Beijing's aggression and maintain peace. A failure to do so, whether by framing U.S.-PRC relations as a "G2" or deprioritizing our efforts to deter the PLA, would be a grave mistake.

As such, I request answers to the following questions no later than January 9, 2026:

1. To what extent does your description of the U.S.-PRC relationship as a "G2" signal a decreased emphasis by the Department of Defense on preparing the U.S. armed forces to deter and, if necessary, defeat military aggression by Beijing?
2. To what extent does your use of the term "G2" reflect a pivot by the Trump administration from a strategy based on competition with the PRC to a strategy focused on cooperation?
3. Was your use of the term "G2" coordinated with interagency partners and did the Pentagon receive criticism from other Executive Branch agencies on its use of this term?
4. What measures, if any, is the Defense Department taking to reassure U.S. allies and partners that your framing of the U.S.-PRC relationship as a "G2" does not jeopardize U.S. mutual defense treaty commitments in the region?

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,



---

Raja Krishnamoorthi  
Ranking Member  
House Select Committee on the CCP

---

<sup>3</sup>['A new arms race': Satellite images, maps and records reveal huge surge in China's missile production sites | CNN](#)